

# Minutes MSc PC – 20 February 2025

Online meeting via Teams and T3-42 10:00–12:00 hours

Present	Absent
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	(MBI)
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)	KB: Kathrin Borner (MI, MBI)
3JV: Jelle de Vries (SCM)	SZ: Solomon Zori (MScBA AFM)
KV: Kristina Vereshchagina (MScBA AFM)	
SP: Suus Pleyte (SM)	
GB: Guido Berens (GBS, P-MM)	
JS: Jeffrey Sweeney (BIM)	
MAS: Maartje Schouten (POC)	
MP: Mihail Pop (MScBA BAM)	
AD: Andreas Distel (SE)	
RH: Reina Hamersak MScBA MiM)	
PJ: Patryk Jarmakowicz (MI)	
PS: Pravar Saran (BIM)	
KK: Korcan Kavusan (MscBA MIM)	
EB: Emanuel Ubert (SM)	
LF: Luca Fanelli (SCM)	
NL: Niccolò Di Leo (SE)	
LW: Lot van Westerveld (GBS)	
SG: Shanifa Goelab (POC)	
AR: Anna-Maria Radeva (FI)	
SML: Sofia Murell Lema (PM)	
SJ: Sarah Janders (MM)	
DY: Dong Yan (FI)	Guests
EH: Evi Hommez (MScBA P-MIM)	

## 1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

Announcement:

MS updated the Committee on a request from Executive Director Quality & Innovation Anna de Waard-Leung to collaborate on RSM Bestuursakkoord 2025-2028.

- 1) MS invited Anna de Waard-Leung to the MSc PC March meeting to discuss the Bestuursakkoord 2025-2028 and which PC members would like to part of the Bestuursakkoord 2025-2028 subcommittee.
- 2) MS asked members to think in advance about a) What are the criteria to assess the Bestuursakkoord 2025-2028 and b) How the PC should evaluate how RSM should spend the innovation money.
- 3) During the meeting, the two following topics will be discussed: a) What are the important elements that the PC needs to assess the quality control and b) How to organise a team which could stay in touch with the Bestuursakkoord 2025-2028 Committee, for example twice a year.

## 2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 30 February 2025– see attachment.

GB: asked AL whether she could make the Minutes documents searchable again.  
AL indicated that she would do that.

## 3. Review of the proposed changes in the MSc curriculum

During this meeting, the PC members voted on proposed changes in multiple master programmes.

- 1) In one of the clusters, the PC members discussed the proposed changes and Figure 1. shows for each change what the clusters recommended to the MSc PC.

Recommendations for PC Decision About MSc programme redesign following Program Cluster Discussion					
No	Programme	Consent Decisions			Advice decisions
		Reduction of the role of co-readers	Cancellation of YFC	Other changes	
1	AFM	Consent	No consent to any changes because none were requested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Merging presentation skills into a core course(s): Consent</li> <li>Merging coding and analytics into a core course: <b>consent</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advice to interact with FI to compare different solutions to a similar structure of core courses and their link with practice.</li> <li>YFC?</li> </ul>
1	FI	Consent	No consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in names and sequence of core courses: <b>consent</b></li> <li>Change in names and sequence of elective courses: <b>consent</b></li> <li>Change to thesis trajectory: <b>consent</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise to make YFC more interactive (PC subcommittee can help)</li> <li>Advice to interact with FI to compare different solutions to a similar structure of core courses and their link with practice.</li> <li>Advice to consider logistical issues related with track switches.</li> <li>Advice to consider what would require to complete a specific elective track (e.g. can student take one elective from other track?) and whether it is possible to issue informal "certificates".</li> </ul>
2	MI & MBI	Conditional consent*	No consent		
2	BIM	Conditional consent*	No consent to any changes because none were requested		
3	POC	Conditional consent*	No consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elective change: <b>consent</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advice: Add ILO 6 to Research Methods course.</li> </ul>

  

			(if the course is maintained by other programmes)		Reconsider ECTS of research methods in light of change to ILO 6.
3	MM	Conditional consent*	No consent		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise to simplify YFC</li> <li>Advice to re-align examination methods with courses: which ones have open question vs multiple choice</li> </ul>
3	BAM	No consent to any changes because none were requested	No consent to any changes because none were requested		
4	SM	Consent	No consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Merger of thesis trajectory: <b>Consent</b></li> </ul>	
4	SE	Consent	No consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change to thesis trajectory: <b>Consent</b></li> <li>ILOs change: <b>consent</b></li> <li>Change to electives: <b>Consent</b></li> <li>No consent as no details shared yet</li> </ul>	Thesis trajectory: Timing of major deliverables should avoid clash with other courses
5	GBS	Consent	No consent		Number of assessments: not clear if would reduce faculty and student workload, student stress
5	SCM	Consent	Consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change to sequence and name of core courses: <b>Consent</b></li> </ul>	

\* Co-reader role conditional consent:  
PC's consent is conditional on setting up a better way to monitor impact of this, and other changes to thesis trajectory. PC advises the dean to 1) facilitate a process of developing quality criteria for thesis trajectory and involve PC in this process, 2) and facilitate assessment of thesis trajectories based on the aforementioned quality criteria.

Figure 1.

- 2) Figure 1. Works as follows: a) Column 1 are the clusters, b) Column 2 indicates the master programmes, c) Column 3, consent decisions are the topics voted on by the members. The table indicates with words and colours each cluster's preference for the programmes it discussed, and d) Column 4 shows the cluster's advises on the proposed changes in the programmes.
- 3) The PC members discussed whether they would choose consent or conditional consent (PC's consent is conditional on setting up a better way to monitor impact of this, and other changes to thesis trajectory. PC advises the Dean to a) Facilitate a process of developing quality criteria for thesis trajectory and involve PC in this process and b) Facilitate assessment of thesis trajectories based on the aforementioned quality criteria) In assessing Reduction of the role of the co-readers, the three perspectives were a) Conditional consent was devised to allow the PC to influence the change in the thesis trajectory process because if the Committee only gave consent, they would have nothing to say after implementing the change while unforeseen side effects may occur, b) Conditional consent isn't a good measurement to evaluate the quality of the process because faculty being coaches probably have more insight based on their own experience than the measurement could create and that will solve problems and perhaps create some biased views that will be distorted by how pleasant the thesis system is as many students feel frustrated in the thesis process then what is the value of the evaluation if the process has to be adjusted every academic year, because the evaluation is based on temporary, partial and biased feedback from students. Therefore, it would be better to add feedback from faculty and thesis coordinators about the thesis quality process and c) To align the thesis trajectory between the different master programmes, it would be better to add learning objectives to the trajectory because the PC could then better compare and assess the process. After the discussion, the PC members decided to use only the terms no consent or consent in the voting process.
- 4) Although all proposals were voted on simultaneously during the meeting, master programmes will receive a separate letter applicable to the programme.
- 5) The Committee voted on the reduction of the role of the co-readers proposal and in vote, one member

abstained and fifteen members voted in favour of the proposal, so the proposal was accepted by the Committee.

6) Since the MSc Pc had to vote on several proposals, they are described one by one:

a) Proposal 1: The cancellation of the Your Future course (YFC) as a part of the curriculum.

On the cancellation of the Your Future Career course, there were different perspectives among the clusters: a) most of the programmes don't want to give consent and they recommended to simplifying the course and making it more interactive, b) There were clusters which would like to discuss the topic during the PC meeting and c) There was one programme which would like to give consent to the proposal.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) MS: It's difficult to get students to assess the YFC because they can't assess the value. On the other hand, alumni indicate that the international intrinsic drive for new employees is important and that is one of the learning objectives of the YFC.
- 2) LW, DY: It would be better to offer the YFC as a voluntary course instead of cancelling it, because as a voluntary course students can still choose to take it.
- 3) PJ: It would better to keep the YFC mandatory because students indicated the course as valuable but they don't want to follow the course if it will become a voluntary course.
- 4) JV: In the MSc SCM programme, the YFC adds little value to the programme. Therefore, the department would like to add the 1 ECTS of the YFC to the Research and Methods course to give this course more space in the programme.
- 5) NL: If the YFC sources will be maintained than the YFC could become a voluntary course because students interested in the course will take it. However, if the YFC no longer has the resources if it's voluntary NL is in favour of keeping the YFC mandatory as it currently is.
- 6) PS: If the YFC is voluntary, not many students will follow it because the deadlines and assignments take priority for students, making the YFC course forgotten. The consequence could be that students will struggle in the labour market while a good career is the main aim of the study.

Note: The vote doesn't apply to MScBA AFM, MSc BA BAM, MSc BIM (they didn't request the change) and MSc SCM.

The Committee voted on the proposal the cancellation of the Your Future course as a part of the curriculum and in vote, two members were in favour and thirteen members voted against the proposal, so the proposal was rejected by the Committee. MS will write a non-consent letter.

b) Proposal 2: The cancellation of the Your Future course (YFC) as a part of the MSc SCM curriculum. The 1 ECTS will be moved to the Research & Method course.

The Committee voted on the proposal the cancellation of the Your Future course as a part of the MSc SCM curriculum and in vote, one member abstained, five members were in favour and eight members voted against the proposal, so the proposal was rejected by the Committee. MS will write a non-consent letter.

c) Proposal 3: The MSc BA AFM programme requested the Committee to merge the presentation skills into a core course.

MS: Academic Director Dr Miriam Koning explained that last year the department discontinued the YFC and created two skill courses and now they would like to merge these two skill courses into one core course.

The proposed merge the presentation skills into a core course change in the MSc BA AFM programme was

unanimously accepted by the Committee. MS will write a consent letter.

d) Proposal 4: The MSc BA AFM programme requested the Committee to merge the coding and analytics course into a core course.

MS: The department would like to merge the small coding and analytics course with a core course.

The proposed merge the small coding and analytics course into a core course change in the MSc BA AFM programme was unanimously accepted by the Committee. MS will write a consent letter.

e) Proposal 5: The MSc FI programme requested the Committee to change the names and sequence of the core courses.

Comments of the Committee:

1) DY: The proposal has the support of the faculty and students of the programme. The tracks aren't mandatory so this is for students to better understand which courses to take and it isn't obliged by students, Therefore, the Committee could consider that most of the advises have been addressed by the programme during the iteration.

The Committee voted on the proposal to change the names and sequence of the core courses and in vote, seven members abstained, and nine members were in favour of the proposal, so the proposal was accepted by the Committee. MS will write a consent letter.

f) Proposal 6: The MSc FI programme requested the Committee to change the names and sequence of the electives.

The Committee voted on the proposal to change the names and sequence of the electives and in vote, four members abstained, and fourteen members were in favour of the proposal, so the proposal was accepted by the Committee. MS will write a consent letter.

g) Proposal 7: The MSc FI programme requested the Committee to change the thesis trajectory.

MS: The MSc FI programme would like to change the thesis trajectory to a process in which students carefully criticize digest and replicate a paper from the list. Afterwards, students will propose which future research could be done based on the paper.

Comments of the Committee:

1) MS recommended that the department would like to know how the thesis process can effectively guide students to produce academically advanced work. The proposed system involves different challenges and therefore solutions than the old system. The scope is smaller but it's meant to go deeper. During the current thesis process, the challenge is to make students identify relevant papers and see where the gap is. In the new process students should focus on one paper and analyse it. According to MS, the problems could be a) The papers look legitimate to the students so it will be a huge challenge for them to analyse it, b) It will easily deteriorate into a simple assignment in which some shortcomings of the papers are obvious, c) The list of papers is limited so it's difficult for students not to collaborate on the papers. Therefore, it would be difficult to create diversity views on the same papers in the thesis, d) There will be academically challenges because of the collaboration between students and it's more difficult to carefully digest a single paper that compensates students for not looking into other papers and e) What it's the students' perspective on this project? Students may feel constrained by working exclusively on a paper that they haven't chosen entirely freely.

2) DY: The current FI thesis trajectory works as follows: Students work on an academic study; they should read the literature and work on the paper. However, students have less understanding on how to code and

implement the path but they propose what they are going to analyse. In the new thesis trajectory, students should still have to collect data and run the regression but instead of not knowing what students getting into, there is a paper to guide them, allowing students to think better in a framework. With this knowledge, students could propose what they want to extend based on their understanding of the preparatory work. With the new proposal, the department would like to improve the quality of the thesis trajectory and decrease students' stress level.

- 3) MAS: It would be better to vote on this topic during the next MSc PC meeting because the new thesis trajectory format could also be interested to other master programmes.
- 4) MAS: It would be useful for the FI department to contact the P-MIM and POC departments to discuss their experiences are with the thesis trajectory format.

After the discussion, the Committee decided to postpone the vote on this topic to the next meeting, thus it can be discussed in more detail before the vote.

- h) Proposal 8: The MSc POC programme requested the Committee to change the electives.  
MS: The MSc POC programme has discontinued two electives and the cluster recommended approval.

The Committee voted on the proposal to change the electives and in vote, five members abstained, and eleven members were in favour of the proposal, so the proposal was accepted by the Committee. MS will write a consent letter.

- i) Proposal 9: The MSc SM and MSc SE programmes requested the Committee to merge thesis trajectory into one course.  
SP: Currently in the thesis trajectory there are three courses the Research Clinic course, the Thesis Trajectory and the Content Qualitative course. The department would like to integrate the Research Clinic course into the Thesis Trajectory course.  
MS: The changes are related to the timing of the current courses, as the Research Clinic course will be taught after Christmas thus it no longer conflicts with the exams and the time between taking the Research Clinic course and writing the thesis will become shorter.

Due to ambiguity, the Committee decided to postpone the vote to the next MSc PC meeting.

**4. Subcommittee work update on the process**

Not discussed.

**5. Closing remarks**

Not discussed.

**6. Action points**

What	When	Who
MS will write a consent letters about the voted topics	By March	Maciej Szymanowski
AL will put proposals seven and nine and the remaining topics on the MSc PC March meeting agenda	By March	Annelie van der Leelie

**7. Next meetings:**

27-Mar-25 09.30h, 17-Apr-25, 09.30h, 22-May-25, 09.30h, 19-Jun-25, 10.00h